

EXHIBIT I

Johnson, James Michael

12/9/2009

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

RICHMOND DIVISION

ePLUS, INC.,)

Plaintiff,)

v.) No. 3:09cv620

LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC.,)

Defendant.)

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, December 9, 2009

Videotape Deposition of JAMES MICHAEL JOHNSON, called
for examination by counsel for Defendant in the
above-entitled matter, the witness being duly sworn
by CHERYL A. LORD, a Notary Public in and for the
District of Columbia, taken at the offices of
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP, 401 9th Street, Suite 1000,
Washington, D.C., at 8:35 a.m., and the proceedings
being taken down by Stenotype by CHERYL A. LORD, RPR,
CRR.

Johnson, James Michael

12/9/2009

Page 190

1 A. It did not have the same information in
2 that table that the catalog would have.

3 Q. What information did the catalog have that
4 the part master table did not have?

5 A. It had information that was a detailed
6 description that would describe the product in great
7 length. It -- the catalog had images where the
8 inventory record would not.

9 It would have detailed specifications on
10 what the product was like dimensions, things of that
11 nature, which the part master would not have.

12 Q. And is it true that the part master record
13 had information that the catalog did not have?

14 A. The part master would have -- the only
15 thing that comes to mind would be like the product
16 type of 01 or an 06, because the catalog wouldn't
17 know that.

18 Q. Well, we were just talking a moment ago
19 about the inventory information.

20 Wouldn't the part master table also have
21 inventory information in it?

22 A. That's true. It would have -- it would
23 have the reorder point information in it. It would
24 have the quantity available at that JIT facility for
25 those 2 product types, things of that nature.